

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COMMISSION DIRECTIVE**

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER

☐

DATE

June 23, 2021

MOTOR CARRIER MATTER

☐

DOCKET NO.

2020-229-E

UTILITIES MATTER

☒

ORDER NO.

SUBJECT:

[DOCKET NO. 2020-229-E](#) - Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated's Establishment of a Solar Choice Metering Tariff Pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-40-20 (See Docket No. 2019-182-E) - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated's Petition for Rehearing and/or Reconsideration and for Clarification Regarding Commission Order No. 2021-391.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Dominion Energy South Carolina filed a Petition for Rehearing and/or Reconsideration and for Clarification that alleged seven issues:

1. The Order's prohibition on recovery of avoided cost credits under S.C. Code. § 58-27-865 known as the (the "Fuel Clause") violated South Carolina law and PURPA principles relating to energy supplied by Qualifying Facilities;
2. The Order did not make clear that renewable energy certificates ("RECs") transfer with the net exported energy supplied by the rooftop solar customers to a utility;
3. The Order improperly characterized elimination of the cost shift as DESC recovering lost revenue and fails to accurately represent DESC's measurement of the same;
4. The Order erred in finding that the Subscription Fee and Basic Facilities Charge are unsupported by the record and (B) penalize customers for behind the meter consumption in violation of Act 62;
5. The Order applied the preponderance of the evidence standard unevenly;
6. The Order erred in its interpretation of the requirement to eliminate "any" cost shift to the greatest extent practicable; and
7. The Order relied heavily upon certain "benefits" of solar that have not been quantified or adopted by this Commission.

Regarding the first issue, I move that the Commission reconsider and clarify that Dominion is not prohibited from recovering avoided costs paid to rooftop solar customers via the Fuel Clause.

Regarding the second issue, I move that the Commission deny the Petition for Rehearing or

Reconsideration.

Regarding issues numbered three, four, six, and seven in its Petition, Dominion restates factual and legal arguments that the Commission explicitly rejected in Order No. 2021-391, and I move that the Commission deny the Petition as it relates to these issues for the same reasons stated in our Order.

Regarding issue five, I move that the Commission make clear that it appropriately evenly applied the preponderance of evidence standard in making its decision in Order. 2021-391, and therefore deny the Petition as it relates to this issue. So moved.

PRESIDING: Belser

SESSION: Regular

TIME: 11:00 a.m.

	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER	
BELSER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Present in Hearing Room
CASTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Voting via WebEx
ERVIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Recused</u>	Voting via WebEx
POWERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Present in Hearing Room
THOMAS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Present in Hearing Room
C. WILLIAMS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Not Voting</u>	Present in Hearing Room
J. WILLIAMS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Voting via WebEx

(SEAL)

RECORDED BY: C. Alvarez

